

Volume of Separable States for Arbitrary N -dimensional System

Dong-Ling Deng¹ and Jing-Ling Chen^{1,*}

¹*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics,
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China*

(Dated: October 11, 2008)

In a celebrated paper ([Phys. Rev. A 58, 883 (1998)]), K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein proved for the first time a very interesting theorem that the volume of separable quantum states is nonzero. Inspired by their ideas, we obtain a general analytical lower bound of the volume of separable states (VOSS) for arbitrary N -dimensional system. Our results give quite simple and computable sufficient conditions for separability. Moreover, for bipartite system, an upper bound of the VOSS is also presented.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ca

Quantum entanglement [1] plays a vital role in producing many rather nonintuitive quantum phenomena such as quantum teleportation [2, 3], quantum parallelism [4], quantum cryptographic schemes [5], dense coding [6, 7], entanglement swapping and remote state preparation [8], etc. From a formal point of view, a state is called entangled (or inseparable) if it cannot be expressed as a mixture of product states. Otherwise, it is separable. Quantum entangled states can produce many nonclassical phenomena, while separable states behave, to some extent, more classically and cannot fulfill the task in quantum information and computation [9]. One question of great importance is then how many entangled or, respectively, separable states there are in the set of all quantum states. In Ref. [10], a brilliant step concerning this problem was done for the first time. In their paper, K. Życzkowski *et al.* proved that the set of separable states possesses a nonzero volume under a nature measure in the space of density matrices describing N -dimensional systems. This work opened a new chapter on the study of quantum entanglement and motivated many other works [11]. Nevertheless, the problem is far from been completely solved and many questions remain open [12].

In this paper, we use a new method based on the generalized spin matrices to estimate the volume of VOSS. We present an analytical lower bound of the VOSS for arbitrary N -dimensional multipartite system. Our results give quite simple and computable sufficient conditions for separability. Moreover, for bipartite system, we show a theorem that there is a neighborhood of the maximally entangled state in which every state is entangled. Based on this, we present a rough and approximate upper bound of the VOSS. The results can also be generalized easily to a more general quantum system.

To start with, we should specify some notations and definitions. Let $H^{[N]}$ denote an N -dimensional Hilbert space where $N = d_1 \times d_2 \times \cdots \times d_n$ and the H_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$) denote the d_k -dimensional Hilbert space of the k th subsystem. A state in $H^{[N]}$ specified by a density matrix ρ is said to be separable if it is a convex

combination of tensor products:

$$\rho = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{\lambda}^{(n)}, \quad (1)$$

where $0 \leq p_{\lambda} \leq 1$, $\sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} = 1$ and $\rho_{\lambda}^{(k)}$ is a density matrix on H_k . In Ref.[13], A. O. Pittenger and M. H. Rubin introduced a generalization of Pauli-spin matrices for d -dimensional spaces by using of the finite Fourier transform. The generalized spin matrices need not be hermitian but they form a basis for $d \times d$ matrices and share many other properties with the real Pauli matrices. Here we briefly review their methodology and main results for completeness. Any one who want to know the details please see Ref.[13] and the reference there in.

We will begin with d -level systems. Let $E_{j,l} = |j\rangle\langle l|$ denotes the computational basis of the d -level system and define the adjusted basis $A = \{A_{j,l}, 0 \leq j, l < d\}$ as the set of $d \times d$ matrices defined by $A_{j,l} = E_{j,j \oplus l}$, where " $\oplus$ " denotes addition modulo d . Then the spin matrices $S = \{S_{j,l}, 0 \leq j, l < d\}$ are defined using the finite Fourier transform: $(S) \equiv F(A)$. Here $F(j, l) = \text{Exp}(2\pi i j l / d)$. In detail,

$$S_{j,l} = \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} F(j, m) A_{m,l}, \quad (2)$$

is a sum of products of scalars times matrices. Obviously, S is also a basis for the $d \times d$ matrices since F is invertible. For the N -dimensional Hilbert space $H^{[N]}$, the sets of computational and adjusted bases $E^{[N]}$ for $N \times N$ matrices are defined as:

$$E_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n E_{j_k, l_k}^{(k)}, \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n A_{j_k, l_k}^{(k)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{j}$ and $\tilde{l}$ correspond to their n tuples and the superscripts in parentheses denote the corresponding d_k . It follows immediately that $A_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{l}}^{[N]} = E_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{j} \oplus \tilde{l}}^{[N]}$, where the addition of the indices is defined by: $\tilde{j} \oplus \tilde{l} \equiv (j_1 + l_1 \bmod d_1, \dots, j_n + l_n \bmod d_n)$. Similarly, define $F^{[N]} =$

$F^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes F^{(n)}$ as the usual tensor product of the Fourier transforms $F^{(k)}$ that depend on d_k . Then the corresponding set of spin matrices $S^{[N]}$ can be defined by $S_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} F^{[N]}(\tilde{j}, \tilde{m}) A_{\tilde{m},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}$, or equivalently by $S_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n (F^{(k)} A^{(k)})_{j_k, l_k}$. A density matrix on the $N \times N$ Hilbert space $H^{[N]}$: $\rho^{[N]} = \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} \rho_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} E_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}$ can also be expanded in adjusted bases and "spin" bases respectively as:

$$\rho^{[N]} = \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} a_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} A_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} S_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}, \quad (4)$$

where $a_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \rho_{\tilde{j},\tilde{j} \oplus \tilde{l}}^{[N]}$ and $(s^{[N]}) = F^{[N]*}(a^{[N]})$.

Now without proof, we rewrite here one of the main results in Ref.[13] (Theorem 1) as a lemma:

Lemma 1: If $\rho^{[N]}$ is a density matrix on $H^{[N]}$, then $\rho^{[N]}$ is $D \equiv (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ separable provided

$$\|\rho^{[N]}\|_{1,D} \equiv \sum_{(\tilde{j},\tilde{l}) \neq (\tilde{0},\tilde{0})} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}| \leq 1, \quad (5)$$

where $\rho^{[N]}$ has the spin representation $\rho^{[N]} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} S_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}$ defined in term of the D tensor product $S_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n S_{j_k, l_k}^{(k)}$.

Lemma 1 provide a sufficient condition for separability of density matrices. Our estimation of the lower bound of VOSS is based on this condition. To process, we need another lemma:

Lemma 2: The matrix elements of a $N \times N$ density matrix $\rho^{[N]}$ in the different bases satisfy the relation: $\sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2 = N \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |\rho_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2$.

Proof. It is very easy to prove the lemma 2 by directly calculation of $\sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2$. Here we present the key steps: $\sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2 = \text{Tr}[(s^{[N]})^\dagger (s^{[N]})] = \text{Tr}[(a^{[N]})^\dagger (F^{[N]*})^\dagger (F^{[N]*})(a^{[N]})] = N \text{Tr}[(a^{[N]})^\dagger (a^{[N]})] = N \text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]^2}] = N \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |\rho_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2$.

Based on the lemma 1 and 2, we can obtain the lower bound of the VOSS. Our main results are as follows:

Theorem 1. Let $\rho^{[N]}$ be a $N \times N$ density matrix on $H^{[N]}$ and $\text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]^2}] \leq \frac{N}{N^2-1}$, then $\rho^{[N]}$ is fully separable.

Proof. On the one hand, let we calculate directly the value of $s_{\tilde{0},\tilde{0}}^{[N]}$. Form (4), it is easy to get: $s_{\tilde{0},\tilde{0}}^{[N]} = [F^{[N]*}(a^{[N]})]_{\tilde{0},\tilde{0}} = \sum_{\tilde{l}=0}^{N-1} F_{\tilde{0},\tilde{l}}^{[N]*} a_{\tilde{l},\tilde{0}}^{[N]} = \sum_{\tilde{l}=0}^{N-1} a_{\tilde{l},\tilde{0}}^{[N]} = \sum_{\tilde{l}=0}^{N-1} \rho_{\tilde{l},\tilde{l}}^{[N]} = \text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]}] = 1$. On the other hand, from lemma 2, one has $\sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2 = N \sum_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}} |\rho_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2 \leq \frac{N^2}{N^2-1}$. Thus

$$\sum_{(\tilde{j},\tilde{l}) \neq (\tilde{0},\tilde{0})} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}|^2 \leq \frac{N^2}{N^2-1} - 1 = \frac{1}{N^2-1}. \quad (6)$$

Noting that $|s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}| \geq 0$ and using the Lagrange Multiplier Methods, one can easily obtain:

$$\sum_{(\tilde{j},\tilde{l}) \neq (\tilde{0},\tilde{0})} |s_{\tilde{j},\tilde{l}}^{[N]}| \leq (N^2-1) \times \frac{1}{N^2-1} = 1. \quad (7)$$

Then from lemma 1, we have that $\rho^{[N]}$ is fully separable. This completes the proof of the theorem. Since $\text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]^2}]$ is a measure of purity of state $\rho^{[N]}$, which ranges from $\frac{1}{N}$ (for a maximally mixed state) to 1 (for a pure state), theorem 1 indicate that the purity and entanglement are closely related. All the states with sufficiently low purity are necessarily separable.

Keeping theorem 1 in mind and using the same method as in Ref.[10] (Sec. IIIC), one can obtain the lower bound of VOSS. However, the calculations may be tedious and the resulting expressions very complex. To get a more distinct expression of the lower bound, we introduce a corollary, which comes directly from theorem 1:

Corollary 1. Let $\rho'^{[N]}$ be an arbitrary $N \times N$ density matrix on $H^{[N]}$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon^* = 1/\sqrt{(N^2-1)(N-1)}$ be a non-negative real number. Then the density matrix $\rho^{[N]} = \frac{(1-\epsilon)}{N} I + \epsilon \rho'^{[N]}$ is fully separable on $H^{[N]}$.

Proof. Note that $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1/\sqrt{(N^2-1)(N-1)}$, then directly calculation of $\text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]^2}]$ led to:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\rho^{[N]^2}] &= \text{Tr}\left[\frac{(1-\epsilon)^2}{N^2} I + \epsilon^2 \rho'^{[N]^2} + 2\frac{(1-\epsilon)\epsilon}{N} \rho'^{[N]}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{1 + (N-1)\epsilon^2}{N} \\ &\leq \frac{N}{N^2-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Then from theorem 1, $\rho^{[N]}$ is fully separable on $H^{[N]}$ and the proof is completed. Corollary 1 not only shows directly that all states in the small enough neighborhood of the totally mixed stat are separable, but also lead to the lower bound of VOSS immediately

$$\mu(\mathcal{S}_{sep}) \geq \mu(\Delta_{\epsilon^*}) = [(N^2-1)(N-1)]^{-(N-1)/2}. \quad (9)$$

Here, μ is the "nature measure" defined in Ref. [10]; $\mathcal{S}_{sep}$ denote the set of separable states on $H^{[N]}$ and Δ_{ϵ^*} is a simplex defined as $\Delta_{\epsilon^*} = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{y}_i = \epsilon^* \mathbf{x}_i + (1-\epsilon^*) \mathbf{z}_I; i = 1, \dots, N; \mathbf{z}_I = (1/N, \dots, 1/N)\}$. Frankly speaking, the lower bound given in (9) is very rough, thus it is not better than some previous results [11]. However, it successfully escapes from tedious and recondite mathematics. What's more, it is a general analytical result and suitable for arbitrary finite dimensional systems.

Now we have an analytical lower bound of VOSS, one may ask a natural question: "what is the upper bound of VOSS, or equivalently, lower bound on the set of entangled states?" To deal with this question, some necessary conditions for separability are needed.

In Ref. [10], K. Życzkowski *et al.* proposed an upper bound for bipartite systems by applying the partial transposition criterion [14]. Here, we introduce a new method, which is based on the concurrence of multipartite mixed states [15, 16], to get an upper bound. For simplicity, we only focus on two d -dimensional (qudit) systems. The results can be easily generalized to a more general system. Let $H_{AB} = H_A \otimes H_B$ denote the $d \times d$ -dimensional Hilbert space of two-qudit system, then the concurrence for a mixed state on H_{AB} is defined as the average concurrence of the pure states of the decomposition, minimized over all decompositions of $\rho = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} |\psi_{\lambda}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda}|$: $C(\rho) = \min \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} C(|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle)$. Here $C(|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle)$ is the concurrence for the pure state $|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle$ defined as: $C(|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle) = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}[\rho_{\lambda A}^2])} = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}[\rho_{\lambda B}^2])}$ with $\rho_{\lambda A} = \text{Tr}_B[|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda}|]$ be the partial trace of $|\psi_{\lambda}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda}|$ over subsystem B and $\rho_{\lambda B}$ a similar meaning. It is proved in Ref. [15] that the concurrence $C(\rho)$ has a lower bound

$$C^2(\rho) \geq 2[\text{Tr}\rho^2 - \text{Tr}\rho_A^2]. \quad (10)$$

Inequality (10) provides a simple sufficient condition for entanglement. If the concurrence of a state ρ is greater than 0, then the state is entangled. Our estimation of lower bound on the set of inseparable states relies on the inequality (10).

Theorem 2. Let ρ'_{AB} be an arbitrary density matrix for bipartite system and $\epsilon < \epsilon^* = \frac{d^2 - \sqrt{d^4 - d(d^2 - 1)}}{(1+d)}$ is a non-negative number, then the density matrix $\rho_{AB} = (1 - \epsilon)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| + \epsilon\rho'_{AB}$ is entangled. Here, $|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state on H_{AB} .

Proof. We will prove this theorem by directly calculating the lower bound of the concurrence of density matrix ρ_{AB} . From the inequality (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^2 &\geq 2[\text{Tr}\rho_{AB}^2 - \text{Tr}\rho_A^2] \\ &= 2\{(1 - \epsilon)^2 + \text{Tr}[2\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)\rho'_{AB}|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| + \epsilon^2\rho'^2_{AB}] \\ &\quad - \text{Tr}[\frac{(1 - \epsilon)^2}{d^2}I + \frac{2(1 - \epsilon)\epsilon}{d}\rho'_A + \epsilon^2\rho'^2_A]\} \\ &\geq 2\left[(1 - \epsilon)^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{d^2} - \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{d} - \epsilon^2\right] \\ &= \frac{2}{d^2}[d(d - 1) - 2d^2\epsilon + (1 + d)\epsilon^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that $\epsilon < \frac{d^2 - \sqrt{d^4 - d(d^2 - 1)}}{(1+d)}$, then from inequality (11), $C(\rho_{AB}) > 0$ is obvious. Theorem 2 indicate that all states in the small enough neighborhood of the maximally entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ are entangled. It is interesting to note that ϵ^* is monotonically increasing with d and goes to $1/2$ as d goes to infinite. It seems like the higher the dimension, the bigger the neighborhood of $|\Psi\rangle$ in which all states are entangled. Theorem 2 leads to a rough and approximate upper bound of VOSS

$$\mu(\mathcal{S}_{sep}) \leq 1 - \left[\frac{d^2 - \sqrt{d^4 - d(d^2 - 1)}}{(1 + d)} \right]^{N-1}. \quad (12)$$

Inequality (12) only suitable for two-qudit systems, one can generalize it to a multipartite systems using the concurrence bound for multipartite systems in Ref. [16].

In summary, we have investigated the question of how many separable or, respectively, entangled states there are in the set of all quantum states for arbitrary N -dimensional systems. We present a analytical and simple lower bound of VOSS by using the a new method based on the separability conditions proposed in Ref. [13]. For two-qudit system, we proved that there also exist a neighborhood of the maximally entangled state in which all quantum states are entangled. Based on this, we present an approximate upper bound of the VOSS. Our results are very rough since we try to avoid recondite mathematics and tedious calculations.

This work was supported in part by NSF of China (Grant No. 10605013), Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, and the Project-sponsored by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

* Electronic address: chenjl@nankai.edu.cn

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [3] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Elbl, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) **390**, 575 (1997); D. Boschi, S. Branca, F. De Martini, L. Hardy, and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1121 (1998).
- [4] D. Deutsch, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **415**, 73 (1989); P. Shor, SIAM J. Comput. **26**, 1484 (1997).
- [5] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
- [6] K. Mattle, H. Weinfurter, P. G. Kwiat, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4656 (1996).
- [7] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).
- [8] M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999).
- [9] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
- [10] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998).
- [11] L. Gurvits and H. Barnum, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042312 (2003); P. B. Slater, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052319 (2005); S. J. Szarek, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032304 (2005); G. Aubrun and S. J. Szarek, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 022109 (2006).
- [12] K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3496 (1999).
- [13] A. O. Pittenger and M. H. Rubin, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 032313 (2000).
- [14] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
- [15] F. Mintert and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140505 (2007).
- [16] L. Aolita, A. Buchleitner, and F. Mintert, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 022308 (2008); X. H. Gao and S. M. Fei, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics **159**, 71 (2008).